arXiv:1408.5545v2 [math.NA] 20 Apr 2016

Analysis of a family of HDG methods for second order elliptic problems *

Binjie Li†, Xiaoping Xie ‡
School of Mathematics, Sichuan University, Chengdu 610064, China

Abstract

In this paper, we analyze a family of hybridizable discontinuous Galerkin (HDG) methods for second order elliptic problems in two and three dimensions. The methods use piecewise polynomials of degree $k \geqslant 0$ for both the flux and numerical trace, and piecewise polynomials of degree $k+1$ for the potential. We establish error estimates for the numerical flux and potential under the minimal regularity condition. Moreover, we construct a local postprocessing for the flux, which produces a numerical flux with better conservation. Numerical experiments in two-space dimensions confirm our theoretical results.

Keywords. HDG, convergence, minimal regularity, postprocessing

1 Introduction

The pioneering works on hybrid (also called mixed-hybrid) finite element methods are due to Pian [28] and Fraejis de Veubeke [22] for the numerical solution of linear elasticity problems. Here the term "hybrid", as stated in [3], means "the constraints on displacement continuity and/or traction reciprocity at the inter-element boundaries are relaxed a priori" in the hybrid finite element model. One may refer to [32, 29, 31, 35, 33, 34, 30, 44, 45, 46, 48] and to [43, 41, 24] respectively for some developments of hybrid stress (also called assumed stress) methods and hybrid strain (also called enhanced assumed strain) methods based on generalized variational principles, such as Hellinger-Reissner principle and Hu-Washizu principle. In [5, 49, 6, 47], stability and convergence were analyzed for several 4-node hybrid stress/strain quadrilateral/rectangular elements. We refer to [7, 10, 9] for the analysis of hybrid methods for 4th order elliptic problems, and to [4, 26, 39, 40] for the analysis for second-order elliptic boundary-value problems. One may see [11, 9, 42, 30] for more references therein on the hybrid methods.

Due to the relaxation of function continuity at the inter-element boundaries, the hybrid finite element model allows for piecewise-independent approximation to the displacement/potential or stress/flux solution, thus leading to a sparse, symmetric and positive definite discrete system through local elimination of unknowns defined in the interior of the elements. This is one main advantage of the hybrid methods. The process of local elimination is also called "static condensation" in engineering literature. In the discrete system, the unknowns are only the globally coupled degrees of freedom of the approximation trace of the " displacement" or "traction" defined only on the boundaries of the elements.

In [15] Cockburn et. al. introduced a unifying framework for hybridization of finite element methods for the second order elliptic problem: find the potential u and the flux $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ such that

$$\begin{cases} \boldsymbol{c}\boldsymbol{\sigma} - \boldsymbol{\nabla} u = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ -\operatorname{div}\boldsymbol{\sigma} = f & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = g & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is a polyhedral domain, $\boldsymbol{c}(x) \in [L^\infty(\Omega)]^{d\times d}$ is a matrix valued function that is symmetric and uniformly positive definite on Ω, $f \in L^2(\Omega)$ and $g \in H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\partial\Omega)$. Here hybridization denotes the process to rewrite a finite element method in a hybrid version. The unifying framework includes as

*This work was supported in part by National Natural Science Foundation of China (11171239) and Major Research Plan of National Natural Science Foundation of China (91430105).

†Email: libinjiefem@yahoo.com
‡Corresponding author. Email: xpxie@scu.edu.cn

particular cases hybridized versions of mixed methods [2, 8, 14], the continuous Galerkin (CG) method [18], and a wide class of hybridizable discontinuous Galerkin (HDG) methods. In [15] three new kinds of HDG methods, or more precisely LDG-H (Local DG-hybridizable) methods, were presented, where the unknowns are the approximations of the potential u and flux $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$, defined in the interior of elements, and the numerical trace of u, defined on the interface of the elements. In [16] an error analysis was carried out for one of the three HDG methods by [15], based on the use of a projection operator inspired by the form of the numerical traces of the methods. Following the same idea as in [16], a unifying framework was proposed in [20] to analyze a large class of methods including the hybridized versions of some mixed methods as well as several HDG methods. We note that in [25], a reduced HDG scheme was proposed, which only includes the potential approximation and numerical trace as unknowns. Recently this HDG method was analyzed in [27] for the Poisson problem.

In this paper, we analyze a family of HDG methods for problem (1.1). We use piecewise polynomials of degree k for both the numerical flux $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h$, and the numerical trace λ_h of u, and use piecewise polynomials of degree $k+1$ for the numerical potential u_h. It should be mentioned that, in [36, 37], the same methods have been analyzed for convection diffusion equations with constant diffusion coefficient and linear elasticity problems, respectively. We note that in our analysis the diffusion coefficient $\boldsymbol{c}(x) \in [L^\infty(\Omega)]^{d\times d}$ is a matrix valued function. By following a similar idea of [23], we establish error estimates for the numerical flux and potential under the minimal regularity condition, i.e.

$$u \in H^1(\Omega) \text{ and } \boldsymbol{\sigma} \in H(\mathrm{div};\Omega).$$

This is significant since the regularity $u \in H^{1+\alpha}(\Omega)$ may not hold for $\alpha > 0.5$ for practical problems. To our best knowledge, such a kind of error estimation has not been established for HDG methods, yet. We note that in [13] an error estimate was established under the condition that $u \in H^{1+\alpha}(\Omega)(\alpha > 0.5)$, while the estimate with $\alpha < 0.5$ is fundamental to the multi-grid method developed there. In our contribution, we also construct a local postprocessing for the flux, which produces a numerical flux $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h^*$ with better conservation.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we follow the general framework in [15] to describe the corresponding HDG methods. Section 3 is devoted to the error estimation for the numerical flux and potential under the minimal regularity condition. Section 4 presents the postprocessing for the flux. Finally Section 5 provides numerical results.

2 HDG method

Let us start by introducing some geometric notations. Let $\mathcal{T}_h$ be a conventional conforming and shape-regular triangulation of Ω, and let $\mathcal{F}_h$ be the set of all faces of $\mathcal{T}_h$. For any $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$, we denote by h_T the diameter of T and set $h := \max_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} h_T$. For any $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$ and $F \in \mathcal{F}_h$, let $V(T)$, $M(F)$ and $\boldsymbol{W}(T)$ be local spaces of finite dimensions. Then we define

$$V_h := \left\{v_h \in L^2(\Omega) : v_h|_T \in V(T) \quad \text{for all } T \in \mathcal{T}_h\right\}, \tag{2.1}$$

$$M_h := \left\{\mu_h \in L^2(\mathcal{F}_h) : \mu_h|_F \in M(F) \quad \text{for all } F \in \mathcal{F}_h\right\}, \tag{2.2}$$

$$\boldsymbol{W}_h := \left\{\boldsymbol{\tau}_h \in [L^2(\Omega)]^d : \boldsymbol{\tau}_h|_T \in \boldsymbol{W}(T) \quad \text{for all } T \in \mathcal{T}_h\right\}. \tag{2.3}$$

For any $g \in L^2(\partial\Omega)$, set

$$M_h(g) := \{\mu_h \in M_h : \langle \mu_h, \eta_h\rangle_{\partial\Omega} = \langle g, \eta_h\rangle_{\partial\Omega} \text{ for all } \eta_h \in M_h\},$$

and define $M_h^0 := M_h(0)$. In addition, for any $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$, define

$$M(\partial T) := \left\{\mu \in L^2(\partial T) : \mu|_F \in M(F) \text{ for all face } F \text{ of } T\right\}, \tag{2.4}$$

and then define $\mathcal{P}_T^\partial : H^1(T) \to M(\partial T)$ by

$$\left\langle \mathcal{P}_T^\partial v, \mu\right\rangle_{\partial T} = \langle v, \mu\rangle_{\partial T} \quad \text{for all } v \in H^1(T) \text{ and } \mu \in M(\partial T). \tag{2.5}$$

Above and in what follows, for any polyhedral domain $D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, we use $(\cdot,\cdot)_D$ and $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_{\partial D}$ to denote the L^2-inner products in $L^2(D)$ and $L^2(\partial D)$ respectively, and for convenience, we shall use $(\cdot,\cdot)$ to abbreviate $(\cdot,\cdot)_\Omega$.

Following [15], the general framework of HDG methods is as follows: seek $(u_h, \lambda_h, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_h) \in V_h \times M_h(g) \times \boldsymbol{W}_h$, such that

$$(\boldsymbol{c}\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h, \boldsymbol{\tau}_h) + (u_h, \operatorname{div}_h \boldsymbol{\tau}_h) - \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} \langle \lambda_h, \boldsymbol{\tau}_h \cdot \boldsymbol{n}\rangle_{\partial T} = 0, \tag{2.6a}$$

$$-(v_h, \operatorname{div}_h \boldsymbol{\sigma}_h) + \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} \left\langle \alpha_T(\mathcal{P}_T^{\partial} u_h - \lambda_h), v_h\right\rangle_{\partial T} = (f, v_h), \tag{2.6b}$$

$$\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} \left\langle \boldsymbol{\sigma}_h \cdot \boldsymbol{n} - \alpha_T(\mathcal{P}_T^{\partial} u_h - \lambda_h), \mu_h\right\rangle_{\partial T} = 0 \tag{2.6c}$$

hold for all $(v_h, \mu_h, \boldsymbol{\tau}_h) \in V_h \times M_h^0 \times \boldsymbol{W}_h$, where the broken divergence operator, div_h, is given by

$$(\operatorname{div}_h \boldsymbol{\tau}_h)|_T := \operatorname{div}(\boldsymbol{\tau}_h|_T) \quad \text{for all } T \in \mathcal{T}_h, \boldsymbol{\tau}_h \in \boldsymbol{W}_h,$$

and α_T denotes a nonnegative penalty function defined on ∂T.

In this paper we choose the local spaces $V(T)$, $M(F), \boldsymbol{W}(T)$ and the penalty parameter α_T as follows:

$$V(T) = P_{k+1}(T), \quad M(F) = P_k(F), \quad \boldsymbol{W}(T) = [P_k(T)]^d, \tag{2.7}$$

$$\alpha_T = h_T^{-1}, \tag{2.8}$$

where, for any nonnegative integer j, $P_j(T)$ and $P_j(F)$ denote the sets of polynomials with degree $\leqslant j$ on T and F respectively. It is easy to obtain the following existence and uniqueness results.

Lemma 2.1. *The HDG scheme* (2.6) *with the choices* (2.7)-(2.8) *admits a unique solution* $(u_h, \lambda_h, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_h) \in V_h \times M_h(g) \times \boldsymbol{W}_h$.

3 Error analysis

We first introduce some notation and conventions. In the rest of this paper, we shall use the standard definitions of Sobolev spaces and their (semi-)norms [1], namely, for an arbitrary open set $D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and any positive integer s,

$$H^s(D) := \{v \in L^2(D) : \partial^\alpha v \in L^2(D) \text{ for all } |\alpha| \leqslant s\},$$

$$\|v\|_{s,D} := \left(\sum_{|\alpha|\leqslant s} \int_D |\partial^\alpha v|^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad |v|_{s,D} := \left(\sum_{|\alpha|= s} \int_D |\partial^\alpha v|^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad \text{for all } v \in H^s(D).$$

We use $\|\cdot\|_D$ and $\|\cdot\|_{\partial D}$ to denote the L^2-norms in $L^2(D)$ and $L^2(\partial D)$ respectively; in particular, we shall use $\|\cdot\|$ to abbreviate $\|\cdot\|_\Omega$. For any $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$ and nonnegative integer j , let $\mathcal{P}_T^j : L^2(T) \to P_j(T)$ be the standard L^2-orthogonal projection operator, and define the operator $\mathcal{P}_h^j$ by

$$(\mathcal{P}_h^j v)|_T := \mathcal{P}_T^j v \quad \text{for all } T \in \mathcal{T}_h \text{ and } v \in L^2(\Omega).$$

In the rest of this paper, $x \lesssim y$ (or $x \gtrsim y$) denotes that there exists a positive constant C such that $x \leqslant Cy$ (or $x \geqslant Cy$), where C only depends on $\boldsymbol{c}$, k, Ω, or the regularity of $\mathcal{T}_h$. The notation $x \sim y$ abbreviates $x \lesssim y \lesssim x$.

3.1 Auxiliary interpolation operators

Define

$$V_h^c := \left\{v_h^c \in H_0^1(\Omega) : v_h^c|_T \in P_1(T) \text{ for all } T \in \mathcal{T}_h\right\}.$$

For any $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$, let $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \ldots, \lambda_{d+1}$ be the conventional barycentric coordinate functions defined on T. Then we denote

$$\Gamma(T) := S_1(T) + S_2(T) + \cdots + S_{d+1}(T), \tag{3.1}$$

where

$$S_i(T) := \left(\prod_{j\neq i}\lambda_j\right)\operatorname{span}\left\{\prod_j \lambda_j^{\alpha_j} : \sum_j \alpha_j = k, \alpha_i = 0\right\}, \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, d+1.$$

We define the first interpolation operator $\Pi_h^0 : L^2(\cup_{F\in\mathcal{F}_h} F) \to V_h^c$ as follows: for any $\mu \in L^2(\cup_{F\in\mathcal{F}_h} F)$, $\Pi_h^0\mu$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \Pi_h^0\mu(a) = \frac{1}{\#\omega_a}\sum_{T\in\omega_a} m_T(\mu) & \text{if } a \text{ is an interior node of } \mathcal{T}_h, \\ \Pi_h^0\mu(a) = 0 & \text{if } a \text{ is a boundary node of } \mathcal{T}_h. \end{cases}$$

Here $\omega_a := \{T \in \mathcal{T}_h : a \text{ is a vertex of } T\}$, $\#\omega_a$ denotes the number of elements in ω_a, and $m_T(\cdot) : L^2(\partial T) \to \mathbb{R}$ is given by

$$m_T(\mu) := \frac{1}{d+1}\sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_T}\frac{1}{|F|}\int_F \mu \quad \text{for all } \mu \in L^2(\partial T), \tag{3.2}$$

where $\mathcal{F}_T := \{F : F \text{ is a face of } T\}$, and $|F|$ denotes the $(d-1)$-dimensional Hausdorff measure.

We proceed to define the second interpolation operator Π_h^1 on $L^2(\Omega)\times L^2(\cup_{F\in\mathcal{F}_h} F)$. Let us start by defining a local version Π_T^1 of Π_h^1 for all $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$. For any $(v,\mu) \in L^2(T)\times L^2(\partial T)$, by the definition (3.1) of $\Gamma(T)$, it is easy to see that there exists a unique $w_1 \in \Gamma(T)$ such that

$$\int_F w_1 q = \int_F \mu q \quad \text{for all } q \in P_k(F) \text{ and } F \in \mathcal{F}_T,$$

and that there exists a unique $w_2 \in (\prod_j \lambda_j)P_k(T)$ such that

$$\int_T w_2 q = \int_T (v - w_1) q \quad \text{for all } q \in P_k(T),$$

and then we define $\Pi_T(v,\mu) := w_1 + w_2$. Now we define Π_h^1 as follows: for any $(v,\mu) \in L^2(\Omega)\times L^2(\cup_{F\in\mathcal{F}_h} F)$ and $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$,

$$\Pi_h^1(v,\mu)|_T := \Pi_T^1(v,\mu).$$

Finally, based on the operators Π_h^0 and Π_h^1, we define the third interpolation operator Π_h on $L^2(\Omega)\times L^2(\cup_{F\in\mathcal{F}_h} F)$ by

$$\Pi_h(v,\mu) := \Pi_h^0\mu + \Pi_h^1(v - \Pi_h^0\mu, \mu - \Pi_h^0\mu) \quad \text{for all } (v,\mu) \in L^2(\Omega)\times L^2(\cup_{F\in\mathcal{F}_h} F). \tag{3.3}$$

The following two lemmas show some properties of the above interpolation operators.

Lemma 3.1. *For any $(v,\mu) \in L^2(\Omega)\times L^2(\cup_{F\in\mathcal{F}_h} F)$, it holds*

$$\left\|\Pi_h^1(v,\mu)\right\|_T \lesssim \|v\|_T + h_T^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\mu\|_{\partial T} \quad \text{for all } T \in \mathcal{T}_h.$$

Lemma 3.2. *For any $(v,\mu) \in L^2(\Omega)\times L^2(\cup_{F\in\mathcal{F}_h} F)$ and $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$, it holds*

$$\left(\Pi_h(v,\mu), q\right)_T = (v,q)_T \quad \text{for all } q \in P_k(T), \tag{3.4}$$

$$\langle \Pi_h(v,\mu), q\rangle_{\partial T} = \langle \mu, q\rangle_{\partial T} \quad \text{for all } q \in P_k(F) \text{ and } F \in \mathcal{F}_T. \tag{3.5}$$

Lemma 3.1 follows from a standard scaling argument, and Lemma 3.2 follows from the definition of Π_h.

3.2 Error estimation for numerical flux

In this subsection, we shall follow the basic idea in [23] to give an error estimate for the numerical flux. We stress that we only need to use the following minimal regularity condition of the problem (1.1):

$$u \in H^1(\Omega) \text{ and } \boldsymbol{\sigma} \in H(\operatorname{div};\Omega). \tag{3.6}$$

Define

$$\boldsymbol{e}_h^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} := \boldsymbol{\sigma}_h - \mathcal{P}_h^k\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \quad e_h^u := u_h - \mathcal{P}_h^{k+1}u, \quad e_h^\lambda := \lambda_h - \mathcal{P}_M u, \tag{3.7}$$

where, $\mathcal{P}_M : H^1(\Omega) \to M_h$ is given by

$$\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} \langle \mathcal{P}_M v, \mu_h\rangle_{\partial T} := \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} \langle v, \mu_h\rangle_{\partial T} \quad \text{for all } \mu_h \in M_h,$$

namely,

$$(\mathcal{P}_M v)|_{\partial T} := \mathcal{P}_T^{\partial}(v|_T) \quad \text{for all } T \in \mathcal{T}_h.$$

In addition, by (1.1) and (2.6a), it is easy to verify that

$$(\boldsymbol{c}\boldsymbol{e}_h^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}, \boldsymbol{\tau}_h) + (e_h^u, \operatorname{div}_h \boldsymbol{\tau}_h) - \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} \langle e_h^{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\tau}_h\cdot\boldsymbol{n}\rangle_{\partial T} = \big(\boldsymbol{c}(I-\mathcal{P}_h^k)\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{\tau}_h\big) \tag{3.8}$$

for all $\boldsymbol{\tau}_h \in \boldsymbol{W}_h$.

We introduce a semi-norm $|||\cdot|||_h : V_h \times M_h \times \boldsymbol{W}_h \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$|||(v_h, \mu_h, \boldsymbol{\tau}_h)|||_h := \left(\|\boldsymbol{\tau}_h\|_{\boldsymbol{c}}^2 + \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} \left\| \alpha_T^{\frac{1}{2}} (\mathcal{P}_T^{\partial} v_h - \mu_h) \right\|_{\partial T}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \tag{3.9}$$

for all $(v_h, \mu_h, \boldsymbol{\tau}_h) \in V_h \times M_h \times \boldsymbol{W}_h$, where

$$\|\boldsymbol{\tau}\|_{\boldsymbol{c}} := (\boldsymbol{c}\boldsymbol{\tau}, \boldsymbol{\tau})^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad \text{for all } \boldsymbol{\tau} \in [L^2(\Omega)]^d.$$

We also set

$$|w|_{1,h} := \left(\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} |w|_{1,T}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

for any $w \in L^2(\Omega)$ with $w|_T \in H^1(T)$ for all $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$.

Now we are ready to state the main result of this subsection.

Theorem 3.1. *It holds*

$$|||(e_h^u, e_h^{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{e}_h^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}})|||_h \lesssim h \left\|(I-\mathcal{P}_h^k) f\right\| + \left\|(I-\mathcal{P}_h^k)\boldsymbol{\sigma}\right\| + \left|(I-\mathcal{P}_h^{k+1}) u\right|_{1,h}, \tag{3.10}$$

which implies

$$\|\boldsymbol{\sigma} - \boldsymbol{\sigma}_h\| \lesssim h \left\|(I-\mathcal{P}_h^k) f\right\| + \left\|(I-\mathcal{P}_h^k)\boldsymbol{\sigma}\right\| + \left|(I-\mathcal{P}_h^{k+1}) u\right|_{1,h}. \tag{3.11}$$

By the estimate (3.11) and standard approximation properties of the L^2-orthogonal projection, we readily obtain the corollary below.

Corollary 3.1. *Suppose that $f \in H^s(\Omega)$, $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in H^{s+1}(\Omega)$, and $u \in H^{s+2}(\Omega)$ for a nonnegative integer s. Then it holds*

$$\|\boldsymbol{\sigma} - \boldsymbol{\sigma}_h\| \lesssim h^{\min\{s+1, k+1\}} \left(\|f\|_{s,\Omega} + \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_{s+1,\Omega} + \|u\|_{s+2,\Omega} \right). \tag{3.12}$$

To prove Theorem 3.1, we need some lemmas below.

Lemma 3.3. *It holds*

$$|e_h^u|_{1,h} \lesssim |||(e_h^u, e_h^{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{e}_h^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}})|||_h + \left\|(I-\mathcal{P}_h^k)\boldsymbol{\sigma}\right\|. \tag{3.13}$$

Proof. By (3.8) and integration by parts, we get that

$$\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} (\boldsymbol{\nabla} e_h^u, \boldsymbol{\tau}_h)_T = (\boldsymbol{c}\boldsymbol{e}_h^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}, \boldsymbol{\tau}_h) + \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} \langle \mathcal{P}_T^{\partial} e_h^u - e_h^{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\tau}_h\cdot\boldsymbol{n}\rangle_{\partial T} - \big(\boldsymbol{c}(I-\mathcal{P}_h^k)\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{\tau}_h\big)$$

for all $\boldsymbol{\tau}_h \in \boldsymbol{W}_h$. Taking $\boldsymbol{\tau}_h := \boldsymbol{\nabla}_h e_h^u$ (i.e., $\boldsymbol{\tau}_h|_T := \boldsymbol{\nabla}(e_h^u|_T)$ for all $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$) in the above equation, and using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
|e_h^u|_{1,h}^2 &= (\boldsymbol{c}\boldsymbol{e}_h^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}, \boldsymbol{\nabla}_h e_h^u) + \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} \langle \mathcal{P}_T^{\partial} e_h^u - e_h^{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\nabla} e_h^u\cdot\boldsymbol{n}\rangle_{\partial T} - \big(\boldsymbol{c}(I-\mathcal{P}_h^k)\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{\nabla}_h e_h^u\big) \\
&\lesssim \|\boldsymbol{e}_h^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}\|\, |e_h^u|_{1,h} + \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} \left\|\mathcal{P}_T^{\partial} e_h^u - e_h^{\lambda}\right\|_{\partial T} \|\boldsymbol{\nabla} e_h^u\|_{\partial T} + \left\|(I-\mathcal{P}_h^k)\boldsymbol{\sigma}\right\| |e_h^u|_{1,h} \\
&\lesssim \left(\|\boldsymbol{e}_h^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}\| + \left\|(I-\mathcal{P}_h^k)\boldsymbol{\sigma}\right\|\right) |e_h^u|_{1,h} + \left(\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} h_T^{-1} \left\|\mathcal{P}_T^{\partial} e_h^u - e_h^{\lambda}\right\|_{\partial T}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} h_T \|\boldsymbol{\nabla} e_h^u\|_{\partial T}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Noting that a standard scaling argument gives

$$h_T \left\|\boldsymbol{\nabla} e_h^u\right\|_{\partial T}^2 \lesssim |e_h^u|_{1,T}^2 ,$$

it follows that

$$|e_h^u|_{1,h} \lesssim \|\boldsymbol{e}_h^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}\| + \left\|(I-\mathcal{P}_h^k)\boldsymbol{\sigma}\right\| + \left(\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} h_T^{-1} \left\|\mathcal{P}_T^{\partial} e_h^u - e_h^{\lambda}\right\|_{\partial T}^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

By the definition (3.9) of $|||\cdot|||_h$, we readily obtain (3.13), and thus complete the proof. ■

Lemma 3.4. *It holds*

$$\left(\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} h_T^{-2} \left\|e_h^u - m_T(e_h^{\lambda})\right\|_T^2 + h_T^{-1} \left\|e_h^{\lambda} - m_T(e_h^{\lambda})\right\|_{\partial T}^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim \left|||(e_h^u, e_h^{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{e}_h^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}})|||_h + \left\|(I-\mathcal{P}_h^k)\boldsymbol{\sigma}\right\|. \tag{3.14}$$

Proof. By the definition (3.2) of $m_T(\cdot)$, a standard scaling argument yields

$$\|e_h^u - m_T(e_h^u)\|_T \lesssim h_T \, |e_h^u|_{1,T} ,$$

and a straightforward computation gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\|m_T(e_h^u) - m_T(e_h^{\lambda})\right\|_T &= \frac{1}{d+1} \left\| \sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_T} \frac{1}{|F|} \int_F (\mathcal{P}_T^{\partial} e_h^u - e_h^{\lambda}) \right\|_T \\
&\leqslant \frac{1}{d+1} \sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_T} \left\| \frac{1}{|F|} \int_F (\mathcal{P}_T^{\partial} e_h^u - e_h^{\lambda}) \right\|_T \\
&\lesssim h_T^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{F\in\mathcal{F}_T} \left\|\mathcal{P}_T^{\partial} e_h^u - e_h^{\lambda}\right\|_F \\
&\lesssim h_T^{\frac{1}{2}} \left\|\mathcal{P}_T^{\partial} e_h^u - e_h^{\lambda}\right\|_{\partial T} .
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, by the definition (3.9) of $|||\cdot|||_h$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} h_T^{-2} \left\|e_h^u - m_T(e_h^{\lambda})\right\|_T^2 &\lesssim \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} h_T^{-2} \left(\|e_h^u - m_T(e_h^u)\|_T^2 + \left\|m_T(e_h^u) - m_T(e_h^{\lambda})\right\|_T^2\right) \\
&\lesssim \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} \left(|e_h^u|_{1,T}^2 + h_T^{-1} \left\|\mathcal{P}_T^{\partial} e_h^u - e_h^{\lambda}\right\|_{\partial T}^2\right) \\
&\lesssim \left|||(e_h^u, e_h^{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{e}_h^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}})|||_h^2 + \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} |e_h^u|_{1,T}^2 ,
\end{aligned}$$

which, together with Lemma 3.3, indicates

$$\left(\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} h_T^{-2} \left\|e_h^u - m_T(e_h^{\lambda})\right\|_T^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim \left|||(e_h^u, e_h^{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{e}_h^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}})|||_h + \left\|(I-\mathcal{P}_h^k)\boldsymbol{\sigma}\right\| .$$

To complete the proof, the thing left is to show, for any $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$,

$$h_T^{-1} \left\|e_h^{\lambda} - m_T(e_h^{\lambda})\right\|_{\partial T}^2 \lesssim h_T^{-2} \left\|e_h^u - m_T(e_h^{\lambda})\right\|_T^2 + \|\boldsymbol{e}_h^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}\|_T^2 + \left\|(I-\mathcal{P}_T^k)\boldsymbol{\sigma}\right\|_T^2 . \tag{3.15}$$

In fact, by (3.8) and integration by parts, we get, for any $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$ and $\boldsymbol{\tau} \in \boldsymbol{W}(T)$,

$$\left\langle e_h^{\lambda} - m_T(e_h^{\lambda}), \boldsymbol{\tau}\cdot\boldsymbol{n}\right\rangle_{\partial T} = (\boldsymbol{c}\boldsymbol{e}_h^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}, \boldsymbol{\tau})_T + (e_h^u - m_T(e_h^{\lambda}), \operatorname{div}\boldsymbol{\tau})_T - \left(\boldsymbol{c}(I-\mathcal{P}_T^k)\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{\tau}\right)_T. \tag{3.16}$$

Let us first show that (3.15) holds in the case of $k = 0$. Evidently, there exists a unique $v \in P_1(T)$ such that

$$\int_F v = \int_F \left(e_h^{\lambda} - m_T(e_h^{\lambda})\right) \quad \text{for all } F \in \mathcal{F}_T. \tag{3.17}$$

Taking $\boldsymbol{\tau} := \boldsymbol{\nabla} v$ in (3.16), and noting the fact that $\operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{\tau} = 0$, we easily get

$$\left\langle e_h^\lambda - m_T(e_h^\lambda), \boldsymbol{\nabla} v \cdot \boldsymbol{n} \right\rangle_{\partial T} \lesssim \|\boldsymbol{\nabla} v\|_T \left(\|\boldsymbol{e}_h^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}\|_T + \left\|(I - \mathcal{P}_T^k)\boldsymbol{\sigma}\right\|_T \right).$$

From (3.17) and integration by parts it follows

$$\left\langle e_h^\lambda - m_T(e_h^\lambda), \boldsymbol{\nabla} v \cdot \boldsymbol{n} \right\rangle_{\partial T} = \langle v, \boldsymbol{\nabla} v \cdot \boldsymbol{n} \rangle_{\partial T} = \|\boldsymbol{\nabla} v\|_T^2 .$$

The above two estimates imply

$$\|\boldsymbol{\nabla} v\|_T \lesssim \|\boldsymbol{e}_h^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}\|_T + \left\|(I - \mathcal{P}_T^k)\boldsymbol{\sigma}\right\|_T .$$

Since (3.17) yields $m_T(v) = 0$, a standard scaling argument gives

$$h_T^{-1} \|v\|_{\partial T}^2 = h_T^{-1} \|v - m_T(v)\|_{\partial T}^2 \lesssim \|\boldsymbol{\nabla} v\|_T^2 .$$

We note that (3.17) also leads to

$$h_T^{-1} \left\|e_h^\lambda - m_T(e_h^\lambda)\right\|_{\partial T}^2 \lesssim h_T^{-1} \|v\|_{\partial T}^2 .$$

As a result, (3.15) with $k = 0$ follows from the above three estimates.

Next we consider the case of $k \geqslant 1$. By the well-known properties of the BDM elements [8], there exists a $\boldsymbol{\tau} \in \boldsymbol{W}(T)$ such that

$$\left\langle e_h^\lambda - m_T(e_h^\lambda), \boldsymbol{\tau} \cdot \boldsymbol{n} \right\rangle_{\partial T} = \left\|e_h^\lambda - m_T(e_h^\lambda)\right\|_{\partial T}^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \|\boldsymbol{\tau}\|_T \lesssim h_T^{\frac{1}{2}} \left\|e_h^\lambda - m_T(e_h^\lambda)\right\|_{\partial T} .$$

Taking the above $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ in (3.16), and using standard inverse estimates, we obtain

$$\left\|e_h^\lambda - m_T(e_h^\lambda)\right\|_{\partial T} \lesssim h_T^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\boldsymbol{e}_h^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}\|_T + h_T^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left\|e_h^u - m_T(e_h^\lambda)\right\|_T + h_T^{\frac{1}{2}} \left\|(I - \mathcal{P}_T^k)\boldsymbol{\sigma}\right\|_T .$$

This implies (3.15), and thus completes the proof. ∎

Define $\boldsymbol{\eta}_h \in \boldsymbol{W}_h$ by

$$(\boldsymbol{\eta}_h, \boldsymbol{\tau})_T := -(e_h^u, \operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{\tau})_T + \left\langle e_h^\lambda, \boldsymbol{\tau} \cdot \boldsymbol{n} \right\rangle_{\partial T} \quad \text{for all } \boldsymbol{\tau} \in \boldsymbol{W}(T) \text{ and } T \in \mathcal{T}_h. \tag{3.18}$$

Lemma 3.5. *It holds*

$$\left(\boldsymbol{\nabla} \Pi_h(e_h^u, e_h^\lambda) - \boldsymbol{\eta}_h, \boldsymbol{q}\right)_T = 0 \tag{3.19}$$

for all $\boldsymbol{q} \in [P_k(T)]^d$ *and* $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$. *Moreover,*

$$\|\boldsymbol{\eta}_h\| \lesssim \left|\!\left|\!\left|(e_h^u, e_h^\lambda, \boldsymbol{e}_h^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}})\right|\!\right|\!\right|_h + \left\|(I - \mathcal{P}_h^k)\boldsymbol{\sigma}\right\| . \tag{3.20}$$

Proof. The relation (3.19) follows from (3.18). In what follows we show (3.20). Taking $\boldsymbol{\tau} := \boldsymbol{\eta}_h|_T$ in (3.18), and using integration by parts and inverse estimates, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_h, \boldsymbol{\eta}_h)_T &= -(e_h^u - m_T(e_h^\lambda), \operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{\eta}_h)_T + \left\langle e_h^\lambda - m_T(e_h^\lambda), \boldsymbol{\eta}_h \cdot \boldsymbol{n} \right\rangle_{\partial T} \\ &\lesssim h_T^{-1} \left\|e_h^u - m_T(e_h^\lambda)\right\|_T \|\boldsymbol{\eta}_h\|_T + \left\|e_h^\lambda - m_T(e_h^\lambda)\right\|_{\partial T} \|\boldsymbol{\eta}_h\|_{\partial T} ,\end{aligned}$$

which, together with the fact that $\|\boldsymbol{\eta}_h\|_{\partial T} \lesssim h_T^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\boldsymbol{\eta}_h\|_T$, implies

$$(\boldsymbol{\eta}_h, \boldsymbol{\eta}_h)_T \lesssim \left(h_T^{-1} \left\|e_h^u - m_T(e_h^\lambda)\right\|_T + h_T^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left\|e_h^\lambda - m_T(e_h^\lambda)\right\|_{\partial T} \right) \|\boldsymbol{\eta}_h\|_T .$$

Then it follows

$$\|\boldsymbol{\eta}_h\|_T \lesssim h_T^{-1} \left\|e_h^u - m_T(e_h^\lambda)\right\|_T + h_T^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left\|e_h^\lambda - m_T(e_h^\lambda)\right\|_{\partial T} ,$$

which, together with Lemma 3.4, yields the estimate (3.20). This completes the proof. ∎

Lemma 3.6. *It holds*

$$\left|\Pi_h(e_h^u, e_h^\lambda)\right|_{1,\Omega} \lesssim \left|\!\left|\!\left|(e_h^u, e_h^\lambda, \boldsymbol{e}_h^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}})\right|\!\right|\!\right|_h + \left\|(I - \mathcal{P}_h^k)\boldsymbol{\sigma}\right\| , \tag{3.21}$$

$$\left(\sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} h_T^{-2} \left\|e_h^u - \Pi_h(e_h^u, e_h^\lambda)\right\|_T^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim \left|\!\left|\!\left|(e_h^u, e_h^\lambda, \boldsymbol{e}_h^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}})\right|\!\right|\!\right|_h + \left\|(I - \mathcal{P}_h^k)\boldsymbol{\sigma}\right\| . \tag{3.22}$$

Proof. Let us first show (3.21). We have, for any $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\left|\Pi_h(e_h^u, e_h^\lambda)\right|_{1,T} \\
&= \left|\Pi_h^0 e_h^\lambda + \Pi_h^1(e_h^u - \Pi_h^0 e_h^\lambda, e_h^\lambda - \Pi_h^0 e_h^\lambda)\right|_{1,T} \quad \text{(by (3.3))} \\
&\leqslant \left|\Pi_h^0 e_h^\lambda\right|_{1,T} + \left|\Pi_h^1(e_h^u - \Pi_h^0 e_h^\lambda, e_h^\lambda - \Pi_h^0 e_h^\lambda)\right|_{1,T} \\
&\leqslant \left|\Pi_h^0 e_h^\lambda - m_T(e_h^\lambda)\right|_{1,T} + \left|\Pi_h^1(e_h^u - \Pi_h^0 e_h^\lambda, e_h^\lambda - \Pi_h^0 e_h^\lambda)\right|_{1,T} \\
&\lesssim h_T^{-1}\left\|\Pi_h^0 e_h^\lambda - m_T(e_h^\lambda)\right\|_T + h_T^{-1}\left\|\Pi_h^1(e_h^u - \Pi_h^0 e_h^\lambda, e_h^\lambda - \Pi_h^0 e_h^\lambda)\right\|_T \quad \text{(by inverse estimates)} \\
&\lesssim h_T^{-1}\left\|\Pi_h^0 e_h^\lambda - m_T(e_h^\lambda)\right\|_T + h_T^{-1}\left\|e_h^u - \Pi_h^0 e_h^\lambda\right\|_T + h_T^{-\frac{1}{2}}\left\|e_h^\lambda - \Pi_h^0 e_h^\lambda\right\|_{\partial T} \quad \text{(by Lemma 3.1)} \\
&\lesssim h_T^{-1}\left\|\Pi_h^0 e_h^\lambda - m_T(e_h^\lambda)\right\|_T + h_T^{-1}\left\|e_h^u - m_T(e_h^\lambda)\right\|_T + h_T^{-\frac{1}{2}}\left\|e_h^\lambda - \Pi_h^0 e_h^\lambda\right\|_{\partial T}.
\end{aligned}
$$

From the estimate

$$
\left\|\Pi_h^0 e_h^\lambda - m_T(e_h^\lambda)\right\|_T \lesssim h_T^{\frac{1}{2}}\left\|\Pi_h^0 e_h^\lambda - m_T(e_h^\lambda)\right\|_{\partial T},
$$

it follows

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\left|\Pi_h(e_h^u, e_h^\lambda)\right|_{1,T} \\
&\lesssim h_T^{-\frac{1}{2}}\left\|\Pi_h^0 e_h^\lambda - m_T(e_h^\lambda)\right\|_{\partial T} + h_T^{-1}\left\|e_h^u - m_T(e_h^\lambda)\right\|_T + h_T^{-\frac{1}{2}}\left\|e_h^\lambda - \Pi_h^0 e_h^\lambda\right\|_{\partial T} \\
&\lesssim h_T^{-1}\left\|e_h^u - m_T(e_h^\lambda)\right\|_T + h_T^{-\frac{1}{2}}\left\|e_h^\lambda - m_T(e_h^\lambda)\right\|_{\partial T} + h_T^{-\frac{1}{2}}\left\|\Pi_h^0 e_h^\lambda - m_T(e_h^\lambda)\right\|_{\partial T},
\end{aligned}
$$

and then, by Lemma 3.4, it holds

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\left|\Pi_h(e_h^u, e_h^\lambda)\right|_{1,\Omega} = \left(\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}\left|\Pi_h(e_h^u, e_h^\lambda)\right|_{1,T}^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\lesssim \left(\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}\left(h_T^{-2}\left\|e_h^u - m_T(e_h^\lambda)\right\|_T^2 + h_T^{-1}\left\|e_h^\lambda - m_T(e_h^\lambda)\right\|_{\partial T}^2 + h_T^{-1}\left\|\Pi_h^0 e_h^\lambda - m_T(e_h^\lambda)\right\|_{\partial T}^2\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\lesssim \left|\!\left|\!\left|(e_h^u, e_h^\lambda, \boldsymbol{e}_h^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}})\right|\!\right|\!\right|_h + \left\|(I - \mathcal{P}_h^k)\boldsymbol{\sigma}\right\| + \left(\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} h_T^{-1}\left\|\Pi_h^0 e_h^\lambda - m_T(e_h^\lambda)\right\|_{\partial T}^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \qquad (3.23)
\end{aligned}
$$

To obtain (3.21), it remains to show

$$
\left(\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} h_T^{-1}\left\|\Pi_h^0 e_h^\lambda - m_T(e_h^\lambda)\right\|_{\partial T}^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim \left|\!\left|\!\left|(e_h^u, e_h^\lambda, \boldsymbol{e}_h^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}})\right|\!\right|\!\right|_h + \left\|(I - \mathcal{P}_h^k)\boldsymbol{\sigma}\right\|.
$$

By the definition of Π_h^0, we have, for any $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$ such that $\overline{T} \subset \Omega$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\|\Pi_h^0 e_h^\lambda - m_T(e_h^\lambda)\right\|_{\partial T} &\lesssim h_T^{\frac{d-1}{2}} \sum_{a\in\mathcal{N}(T)}\left|\Pi_h^0 e_h^\lambda(a) - m_T(e_h^\lambda)\right| \\
&\lesssim h_T^{\frac{d-1}{2}} \sum_{a\in\mathcal{N}(T)} \sum_{\substack{T_1,T_2\in\omega_a \\ |\partial T_1\cap\partial T_2|\neq 0}} \left|m_{T_1}(e_h^\lambda) - m_{T_2}(e_h^\lambda)\right| \\
&\lesssim h_T^{\frac{d-1}{2}} \sum_{a\in\mathcal{N}(T)} \sum_{\substack{T_1,T_2\in\omega_a \\ |\partial T_1\cap\partial T_2|\neq 0}} h_T^{-\frac{d-1}{2}}\left\|m_{T_1}(e_h^\lambda) - m_{T_2}(e_h^\lambda)\right\|_{\partial T_1\cap\partial T_2} \\
&\lesssim \sum_{a\in\mathcal{N}(T)} \sum_{\substack{T_1,T_2\in\omega_a \\ |\partial T_1\cap\partial T_2|\neq 0}} \left(\left\|e_h^\lambda - m_{T_1}(e_h^\lambda)\right\|_{\partial T_1\cap\partial T_2} + \left\|e_h^\lambda - m_{T_2}(e_h^\lambda)\right\|_{\partial T_1\cap\partial T_2}\right) \\
&\lesssim \sum_{a\in\mathcal{N}(T)} \sum_{T'\in\omega_a}\left\|e_h^\lambda - m_{T'}(e_h^\lambda)\right\|_{\partial T'},
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\mathcal{N}(T)$ denotes the set of vertexes of T, and we recall the definition of ω_a by

$$\omega_a := \{T \in \mathcal{T}_h : \ a \text{ is a vertex of } T\}.$$

Similarly, for any $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$ such that $\partial T \cap \partial\Omega \neq \emptyset$, we also have

$$\left\|\Pi_h^0 e_h^\lambda - m_T(e_h^\lambda)\right\|_{\partial T} \lesssim \sum_{a\in\mathcal{N}(T)} \sum_{T'\in\omega_a} \left\|e_h^\lambda - m_{T'}(e_h^\lambda)\right\|_{\partial T'}.$$

As a consequence, from Lemma 3.4 it follows

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} h_T^{-1}\left\|\Pi_h^0 e_h^\lambda - m_T(e_h^\lambda)\right\|_{\partial T}^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
\lesssim &\left(\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}\sum_{a\in\mathcal{N}(T)}\sum_{T'\in\omega_a} h_{T'}^{-1}\left\|e_h^\lambda - m_{T'}(e_h^\lambda)\right\|_{\partial T'}^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
\lesssim &\left(\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} h_T^{-1}\left\|e_h^\lambda - m_T(e_h^\lambda)\right\|_{\partial T}^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
\lesssim &\left|\!\left|\!\left|(e_h^u, e_h^\lambda, \boldsymbol{e}_h^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}})\right|\!\right|\!\right|_h + \left\|(I-\mathcal{P}_h^k)\boldsymbol{\sigma}\right\|.
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of (3.21).

Next, let us show (3.22). By Lemma 3.2 we have

$$\mathcal{P}_T^0 e_h^u = \mathcal{P}_T^0 \Pi_h(e_h^u, e_h^\lambda) \quad \text{for all } T \in \mathcal{T}_h.$$

Using standard approximation properties of the L^2-orthogonal projection, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\|e_h^u - \Pi_h(e_h^u, e_h^\lambda)\right\|_T &= \left\|(I-\mathcal{P}_T^0)e_h^u - (I-\mathcal{P}_T^0)\Pi_h(e_h^u, e_h^\lambda)\right\|_T \\
&\leqslant \left\|(I-\mathcal{P}_T^0)e_h^u\right\|_T + \left\|(I-\mathcal{P}_T^0)\Pi_h(e_h^u, e_h^\lambda)\right\|_T \\
&\lesssim h_T\left|e_h^u\right|_{1,T} + h_T\left|\Pi_h(e_h^u, e_h^\lambda)\right|_{1,T}
\end{aligned}$$

for all $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$. Then, from Lemma 3.3 and (3.21) it follows

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} h_T^{-2}\left\|e_h^u - \Pi_h(e_h^u, e_h^\lambda)\right\|_T^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} &\lesssim \left(\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}\left(\left|e_h^u\right|_{1,T}^2 + \left|\Pi_h(e_h^u, e_h^\lambda)\right|_{1,T}^2\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\lesssim \left|\!\left|\!\left|(e_h^u, e_h^\lambda, \boldsymbol{e}_h^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}})\right|\!\right|\!\right|_h + \left\|(I-\mathcal{P}_h^k)\boldsymbol{\sigma}\right\|.
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. ■

Finally, we are in a position to prove Theorem 3.1.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. By (3.8), (2.6b) and (2.6c), straightforward algebraic calculations show

$$\begin{aligned}
&(\boldsymbol{c}\boldsymbol{e}_h^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}, \boldsymbol{e}_h^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}) + (e_h^u, \operatorname{div}_h \boldsymbol{e}_h^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}) - \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}\langle e_h^\lambda, \boldsymbol{e}_h^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}\cdot\boldsymbol{n}\rangle_{\partial T} = \big(\boldsymbol{c}(I-\mathcal{P}_h^k)\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{e}_h^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}\big), \\
&-(e_h^u, \operatorname{div}_h \boldsymbol{e}_h^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}) + \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}\left\langle\alpha_T(\mathcal{P}_T^\partial e_h^u - e_h^\lambda), e_h^u\right\rangle_{\partial T} = (f, e_h^u) + (e_h^u, \operatorname{div}_h \mathcal{P}_h^k\boldsymbol{\sigma}) - \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}\left\langle\alpha_T\mathcal{P}_T^\partial(\mathcal{P}_T^{k+1}u - u), e_h^u\right\rangle_{\partial T}, \\
&\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}\left\langle\boldsymbol{e}_h^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}\cdot\boldsymbol{n} - \alpha_T(\mathcal{P}_T^\partial e_h^u - e_h^\lambda), e_h^\lambda\right\rangle_{\partial T} = -\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}\left\langle\mathcal{P}_T^k\boldsymbol{\sigma}\cdot\boldsymbol{n} - \alpha_T\mathcal{P}_T^\partial(\mathcal{P}_T^{k+1}u - u), e_h^\lambda\right\rangle_{\partial T}.
\end{aligned}$$

Adding the above three equations, we easily get

$$\left|\!\left|\!\left|(e_h^u, e_h^\lambda, \boldsymbol{e}_h^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}})\right|\!\right|\!\right|_h^2 = \mathbb{I}_1 + \mathbb{I}_2 + \mathbb{I}_3, \tag{3.24}$$

where

$$\mathbb{I}_1 := \big(\boldsymbol{c}(I-\mathcal{P}_h^k)\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{e}_h^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}\big),$$
$$\mathbb{I}_2 := -\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} \big\langle \alpha_T(\mathcal{P}_T^{k+1}u - u), \mathcal{P}_T^{\partial} e_h^u - e_h^{\lambda}\big\rangle_{\partial T},$$
$$\mathbb{I}_3 := (f, e_h^u) + (e_h^u, \operatorname{div}_h \mathcal{P}_h^k\boldsymbol{\sigma}) - \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} \big\langle \mathcal{P}_T^k\boldsymbol{\sigma}\cdot\boldsymbol{n}, e_h^{\lambda}\big\rangle_{\partial T}.$$

In light of the definition (3.9) of $|||\cdot|||_h$ and the fact that $\alpha_T = h_T^{-1}$, we have

$$\mathbb{I}_1 + \mathbb{I}_2 \lesssim \left(\big\|(I-\mathcal{P}_h^k)\boldsymbol{\sigma}\big\| + \left(\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} h_T^{-1}\big\|(I-\mathcal{P}_T^{k+1})u\big\|_{\partial T}^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) |||(e_h^u, e_h^{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{e}_h^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}})|||_h. \tag{3.25}$$

By the definition (3.18) of $\boldsymbol{\eta}_h$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{I}_3 = (f, e_h^u) - (\boldsymbol{\eta}_h, \boldsymbol{\sigma}) = \big(f, e_h^u - \Pi_h(e_h^u, e_h^{\lambda})\big) + \big(f, \Pi_h(e_h^u, e_h^{\lambda})\big) - (\boldsymbol{\eta}_h, \boldsymbol{\sigma}).$$

Since $-\operatorname{div}\boldsymbol{\sigma} = f \in L^2(\Omega)$ and $\Pi_h(e_h^u, e_h^{\lambda}) \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, using integration by parts, we get

$$\big(f, \Pi_h(e_h^u, e_h^{\lambda})\big) = \big(-\operatorname{div}\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \Pi_h(e_h^u, e_h^{\lambda})\big) = \big(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{\nabla}\Pi_h(e_h^u, e_h^{\lambda})\big).$$

The above two equations indicate

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{I}_3 &= \big(f, e_h^u - \Pi_h(e_h^u, e_h^{\lambda})\big) + \big(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{\nabla}\Pi_h(e_h^u, e_h^{\lambda}) - \boldsymbol{\eta}_h\big)\\
&= \big((I-\mathcal{P}_h^k)f, e_h^u - \Pi_h(e_h^u, e_h^{\lambda})\big) + \big((I-\mathcal{P}_h^k)\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{\nabla}\Pi_h(e_h^u, e_h^{\lambda}) - \boldsymbol{\eta}_h\big) \quad \text{(by Lemmas 3.2 and 3.5)}\\
&\leqslant \big\|(I-\mathcal{P}_h^k)f\big\|\,\big\|e_h^u - \Pi_h(e_h^u, e_h^{\lambda})\big\| + \big\|(I-\mathcal{P}_h^k)\boldsymbol{\sigma}\big\|\,\big\|\boldsymbol{\nabla}\Pi_h(e_h^u, e_h^{\lambda}) - \boldsymbol{\eta}_h\big\|\\
&\leqslant \big\|(I-\mathcal{P}_h^k)f\big\|\,\big\|e_h^u - \Pi_h(e_h^u, e_h^{\lambda})\big\| + \big\|(I-\mathcal{P}_h^k)\boldsymbol{\sigma}\big\|\,\big(\,\big|\Pi_h(e_h^u, e_h^{\lambda})\big|_{1,\Omega} + \|\boldsymbol{\eta}_h\|\,\big).
\end{aligned}$$

This, together with Lemmas 3.5 and 3.6, implies

$$\mathbb{I}_3 \lesssim \big(h\big\|(I-\mathcal{P}_h^k)f\big\| + \big\|(I-\mathcal{P}_h^k)\boldsymbol{\sigma}\big\|\big)\left(|||(e_h^u, e_h^{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{e}_h^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}})|||_h + \big\|(I-\mathcal{P}_h^k)\boldsymbol{\sigma}\big\|\right). \tag{3.26}$$

Finally, using (3.24)-(3.26) and Young's inequality

$$ab \leqslant \epsilon a^2 + \frac{1}{4\epsilon}b^2 \quad \text{for all } \epsilon > 0,$$

we easily obtain

$$|||(e_h^u, e_h^{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{e}_h^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}})|||_h^2 \lesssim h^2\big\|(I-\mathcal{P}_h^k)f\big\|^2 + \big\|(I-\mathcal{P}_h^k)\boldsymbol{\sigma}\big\|^2 + \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} h_T^{-1}\big\|(I-\mathcal{P}_T^{k+1})u\big\|_{\partial T}^2.$$

Consequently, (3.10) follows directly from the following standard estimate:

$$h_T^{-1}\big\|(I-\mathcal{P}_T^{k+1})u\big\|_{\partial T}^2 \lesssim \big|(I-\mathcal{P}_T^{k+1})u\big|_{1,T}^2 \quad \text{for all } T\in\mathcal{T}_h.$$

Since (3.11) is a direct consequence of (3.10), the proof of Theorem 3.1 is finished. ■

3.3 Error estimation for numerical potential

Similarly to [16], we shall use Aubin-Nitsche's technique of duality argument to derive the error estimation for the numerical potential u_h. Let us introduce the following dual problem:

$$\begin{cases} \boldsymbol{c}\boldsymbol{\Phi} - \boldsymbol{\nabla}\phi = 0 & \text{in } \Omega,\\ \operatorname{div}\boldsymbol{\Phi} = -e_h^u & \text{in } \Omega,\\ \phi = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{3.27}$$

where, as defined in (3.7), $e_h^u := u_h - \mathcal{P}_h^{k+1}u$. We stress that, in the following analysis, we only use the following minimal regularity condition of the dual problem (3.27):

$$\phi \in H_0^1(\Omega) \quad \text{and} \quad \boldsymbol{\Phi} \in H(\operatorname{div};\Omega). \tag{3.28}$$

The main result of this subsection is the following theorem:

Theorem 3.2. *It holds*

$$\|e_h^u\| \lesssim h\,|||(e_h^u, e_h^\lambda, \boldsymbol{e}_h^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}})|||_h + h\,\|(I-\mathcal{P}_h^k)\boldsymbol{\sigma}\| + \|(I-\mathcal{P}_h^0)\boldsymbol{\Phi}\|^{\frac12}\Big(|||(e_h^u, e_h^\lambda, \boldsymbol{e}_h^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}})|||_h + \|(I-\mathcal{P}_h^k)\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|\Big)^{\frac12}$$
$$+ \|(I-\mathcal{P}_h^{k+1})f\|^{\frac12}\,\|(I-\mathcal{P}_h^{k+1})\phi\|^{\frac12} + \Big(|||(e_h^u, e_h^\lambda, \boldsymbol{e}_h^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}})|||_h + |(I-\mathcal{P}_h^{k+1})u|_{1,h}\Big)^{\frac12}|(I-\mathcal{P}_h^{k+1})\phi|_{1,h}^{\frac12}. \tag{3.29}$$

Proof. Since $\boldsymbol{\Phi}\in H(\mathrm{div};\Omega)$ and $\Pi_h(e_h^u, e_h^\lambda)\in H_0^1(\Omega)$, using integration by parts gives

$$-\big(\Pi_h(e_h^u, e_h^\lambda), \mathrm{div}\,\boldsymbol{\Phi}\big) = \big(\boldsymbol{\nabla}\Pi_h(e_h^u, e_h^\lambda), \boldsymbol{\Phi}\big).$$

It follows

$$\begin{aligned}
&-\big(\Pi_h(e_h^u, e_h^\lambda), \mathrm{div}\,\boldsymbol{\Phi}\big)\\
&= \big(\boldsymbol{\nabla}\Pi_h(e_h^u, e_h^\lambda), (I-\mathcal{P}_h^0)\boldsymbol{\Phi}\big) + \big(\boldsymbol{\nabla}\Pi_h(e_h^u, e_h^\lambda), \mathcal{P}_h^0\boldsymbol{\Phi}\big)\\
&= \big(\boldsymbol{\nabla}\Pi_h(e_h^u, e_h^\lambda), (I-\mathcal{P}_h^0)\boldsymbol{\Phi}\big) + \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}\big\langle\Pi_h(e_h^u, e_h^\lambda), \mathcal{P}_T^0\boldsymbol{\Phi}\cdot\boldsymbol{n}\big\rangle_{\partial T} \quad \text{(by integration by parts)}\\
&= \big(\boldsymbol{\nabla}\Pi_h(e_h^u, e_h^\lambda), (I-\mathcal{P}_h^0)\boldsymbol{\Phi}\big) + \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}\big\langle e_h^\lambda, \mathcal{P}_T^0\boldsymbol{\Phi}\cdot\boldsymbol{n}\big\rangle_{\partial T} \quad \text{(by Lemma 3.2)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\|e_h^u\|^2 &= \big(e_h^u - \Pi_h(e_h^u, e_h^\lambda), e_h^u\big) + \big(\Pi_h(e_h^u, e_h^\lambda), e_h^u\big)\\
&= \big(e_h^u - \Pi_h(e_h^u, e_h^\lambda), e_h^u\big) - \big(\Pi_h(e_h^u, e_h^\lambda), \mathrm{div}\,\boldsymbol{\Phi}\big) \quad \text{(by (3.27))}\\
&= \mathbb{I}_1 + \mathbb{I}_2 + \mathbb{I}_3,
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{I}_1 &:= \big(e_h^u - \Pi_h(e_h^u, e_h^\lambda), e_h^u\big),\\
\mathbb{I}_2 &:= \big(\boldsymbol{\nabla}\Pi_h(e_h^u, e_h^\lambda), (I-\mathcal{P}_h^0)\boldsymbol{\Phi}\big),\\
\mathbb{I}_3 &:= \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}\big\langle e_h^\lambda, \mathcal{P}_T^0\boldsymbol{\Phi}\cdot\boldsymbol{n}\big\rangle_{\partial T}.
\end{aligned}$$

By (3.22) it holds

$$\mathbb{I}_1 \lesssim h\Big(|||(e_h^u, e_h^\lambda, \boldsymbol{e}_h^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}})|||_h + \|(I-\mathcal{P}_h^k)\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|\Big)\,\|e_h^u\|.$$

By (3.21) it holds

$$\mathbb{I}_2 \lesssim \Big(|||(e_h^u, e_h^\lambda, \boldsymbol{e}_h^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}})|||_h + \|(I-\mathcal{P}_h^k)\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|\Big)\,\|(I-\mathcal{P}_h^0)\boldsymbol{\Phi}\|.$$

Now let us estimate $\mathbb{I}_3$. In view of (1.1), (3.27) and integration by parts, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\big(\boldsymbol{c}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}-\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h), \boldsymbol{\Phi}\big) = (\boldsymbol{\sigma}-\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h, \boldsymbol{c}\boldsymbol{\Phi}) = (\boldsymbol{\sigma}-\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h, \boldsymbol{\nabla}\phi)\\
&= (f,\phi) + \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}\Big((\mathrm{div}\,\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h, \phi)_T - \langle\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h\cdot\boldsymbol{n}, \phi\rangle_{\partial T}\Big)\\
&= (f,\phi) + \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}\Big((\mathrm{div}\,\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h, \mathcal{P}_T^{k+1}\phi)_T - \big\langle\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h\cdot\boldsymbol{n}, \mathcal{P}_T^\partial\phi\big\rangle_{\partial T}\Big).
\end{aligned}$$

From (2.6b) it follows

$$(\mathrm{div}_h\,\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h, \mathcal{P}_h^{k+1}\phi) = -(f, \mathcal{P}_h^{k+1}\phi) + \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}\big\langle\alpha_T(\mathcal{P}_T^\partial u_h - \lambda_h), \mathcal{P}_T^{k+1}\phi\big\rangle_{\partial T}.$$

From (2.6c) it follows

$$\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}\big\langle\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h\cdot\boldsymbol{n}, \mathcal{P}_T^\partial\phi\big\rangle_{\partial T} = \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}\big\langle\alpha_T(\mathcal{P}_T^\partial u_h - \lambda_h), \mathcal{P}_T^\partial\phi\big\rangle_{\partial T} = \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}\big\langle\alpha_T(\mathcal{P}_T^\partial u_h - \lambda_h), \phi\big\rangle_{\partial T}.$$

The above three equations lead to

$$\begin{aligned}\big(\boldsymbol{c}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}-\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h),\boldsymbol{\Phi}\big) &= \big(f,(I-\mathcal{P}_h^{k+1})\phi\big) - \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}\big\langle\alpha_T(\mathcal{P}_T^{\partial}u_h-\lambda_h),(I-\mathcal{P}_T^{k+1})\phi\big\rangle_{\partial T}\\ &= \big((I-\mathcal{P}_h^{k+1})f,(I-\mathcal{P}_h^{k+1})\phi\big) - \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}\big\langle\alpha_T(\mathcal{P}_T^{\partial}u_h-\lambda_h),(I-\mathcal{P}_T^{k+1})\phi\big\rangle_{\partial T}.\end{aligned}$$

This equation, together with (3.8) and the fact that $\operatorname{div}\mathcal{P}_T^0\boldsymbol{\Phi}=0$ for all $T\in\mathcal{T}_h$, gives

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{I}_3 &= \big(\boldsymbol{c}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h-\boldsymbol{\sigma}),\mathcal{P}_h^0\boldsymbol{\Phi}\big)\\ &= \big(\boldsymbol{c}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h-\boldsymbol{\sigma}),\boldsymbol{\Phi}\big) - \big(\boldsymbol{c}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h-\boldsymbol{\sigma}),(I-\mathcal{P}_h^0)\boldsymbol{\Phi}\big)\\ &= -\big((I-\mathcal{P}_h^{k+1})f,(I-\mathcal{P}_h^{k+1})\phi\big) + \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}\big\langle\alpha_T(\mathcal{P}_T^{\partial}u_h-\lambda_h),(I-\mathcal{P}_T^{k+1})\phi\big\rangle_{\partial T} - \big(\boldsymbol{c}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h-\boldsymbol{\sigma}),(I-\mathcal{P}_h^0)\boldsymbol{\Phi}\big).\end{aligned}$$

Using the Cauchy Schwarz inequality and the fact that $\alpha_T=h_T^{-1}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{I}_3 &\lesssim \big\|(I-\mathcal{P}_h^{k+1})f\big\|\,\big\|(I-\mathcal{P}_h^{k+1})\phi\big\| + \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}-\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h\|\,\big\|(I-\mathcal{P}_h^0)\boldsymbol{\Phi}\big\| + \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}\Big\|\alpha_T^{\frac12}(\mathcal{P}_T^{\partial}u_h-\lambda_h)\Big\|_{\partial T}\Big\|\alpha_T^{\frac12}(I-\mathcal{P}_T^{k+1})\phi\Big\|_{\partial T}\\ &\lesssim \big\|(I-\mathcal{P}_h^{k+1})f\big\|\,\big\|(I-\mathcal{P}_h^{k+1})\phi\big\| + \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}-\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h\|\,\big\|(I-\mathcal{P}_h^0)\boldsymbol{\Phi}\big\| +\\ &\quad\left(\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}h_T^{-1}\big\|(\mathcal{P}_T^{\partial}u_h-\lambda_h)\big\|_{\partial T}^2\right)^{\frac12}\left(\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}h_T^{-1}\big\|(I-\mathcal{P}_T^{k+1})\phi\big\|_{\partial T}^2\right)^{\frac12}.\end{aligned}\tag{3.30}$$

Using the definition (3.7) of e_h^u and e_h^λ, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}h_T^{-1}\big\|\mathcal{P}_T^{\partial}u_h-\lambda_h\big\|_{\partial T}^2\\ &= \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}h_T^{-1}\big\|\mathcal{P}_T^{\partial}e_h^u-e_h^\lambda+\mathcal{P}_T^{\partial}(\mathcal{P}_T^{k+1}u-u)\big\|_{\partial T}^2\\ &\lesssim \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}\Big(h_T^{-1}\big\|\mathcal{P}_T^{\partial}e_h^u-e_h^\lambda\big\|_{\partial T}^2+h_T^{-1}\big\|\mathcal{P}_T^{\partial}(\mathcal{P}_T^{k+1}u-u)\big\|_{\partial T}^2\Big)\\ &\lesssim \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}\Big(h_T^{-1}\big\|\mathcal{P}_T^{\partial}e_h^u-e_h^\lambda\big\|_{\partial T}^2+h_T^{-1}\big\|(I-\mathcal{P}_T^{k+1})u\big\|_{\partial T}^2\Big).\end{aligned}$$

From the definition (3.9) of $|||\cdot|||_h$, it follows that

$$\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}h_T^{-1}\big\|\mathcal{P}_T^{\partial}u_h-\lambda_h\big\|_{\partial T}^2 \lesssim \big|||(e_h^u,e_h^\lambda,\boldsymbol{e}_h^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}})\big|||_h^2 + \sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}h_T^{-1}\big\|(I-\mathcal{P}_T^{k+1})u\big\|_{\partial T}^2.$$

Collecting (3.30) and the above estimate, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{I}_3 \lesssim{}& \big\|(I-\mathcal{P}_h^{k+1})f\big\|\,\big\|(I-\mathcal{P}_h^{k+1})\phi\big\| + \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}-\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h\|\,\big\|(I-\mathcal{P}_h^0)\boldsymbol{\Phi}\big\| +\\ &\left(\big|||(e_h^u,e_h^\lambda,\boldsymbol{e}_h^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}})\big|||_h + \left(\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}h_T^{-1}\big\|(I-\mathcal{P}_T^{k+1})u\big\|_{\partial T}^2\right)^{\frac12}\right)\left(\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h}h_T^{-1}\big\|(I-\mathcal{P}_T^{k+1})\phi\big\|_{\partial T}^2\right)^{\frac12}.\end{aligned}$$

Using standard approximation properties of the L^2-orthogonal projection, we get, for all $T\in\mathcal{T}_h$,

$$\begin{aligned}h_T^{-1}\big\|(I-\mathcal{P}_T^{k+1})u\big\|_{\partial T}^2 &\lesssim \big|(I-\mathcal{P}_T^{k+1})u\big|_{1,T}^2,\\ h_T^{-1}\big\|(I-\mathcal{P}_T^{k+1})\phi\big\|_{\partial T}^2 &\lesssim \big|(I-\mathcal{P}_T^{k+1})\phi\big|_{1,T}^2.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, it follows

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{I}_3 \lesssim{}& \big\|(I-\mathcal{P}_h^{k+1})f\big\|\,\big\|(I-\mathcal{P}_h^{k+1})\phi\big\| + \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}-\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h\|\,\big\|(I-\mathcal{P}_h^0)\boldsymbol{\Phi}\big\| +\\ &\Big(\big|||(e_h^u,e_h^\lambda,\boldsymbol{e}_h^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}})\big|||_h + \big|(I-\mathcal{P}_h^{k+1})u\big|_{1,h}\Big)\,\big|(I-\mathcal{P}_h^{k+1})\phi\big|_{1,h}.\end{aligned}$$

Finally, using these estimates for $\mathbb{I}_1$, $\mathbb{I}_2$, $\mathbb{I}_3$, Young's inequality, and the fact that

$$\|\boldsymbol{\sigma}-\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h\| \lesssim \left|\!\left|\!\left|(e_h^u, e_h^\lambda, \boldsymbol{e}_h^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}})\right|\!\right|\!\right|_h + \left\|(I-\mathcal{P}_h^k)\boldsymbol{\sigma}\right\|,$$

we easily obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\|e_h^u\|^2 \lesssim\ & h^2 \left|\!\left|\!\left|(e_h^u, e_h^\lambda, \boldsymbol{e}_h^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}})\right|\!\right|\!\right|_h^2 + h^2 \left\|(I-\mathcal{P}_h^k)\boldsymbol{\sigma}\right\|^2 + \left\|(I-\mathcal{P}_h^0)\boldsymbol{\Phi}\right\| \left(\left|\!\left|\!\left|(e_h^u, e_h^\lambda, \boldsymbol{e}_h^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}})\right|\!\right|\!\right|_h + \left\|(I-\mathcal{P}_h^k)\boldsymbol{\sigma}\right\| \right) \\ & + \left\|(I-\mathcal{P}_h^{k+1})f\right\| \left\|(I-\mathcal{P}_h^{k+1})\phi\right\| + \left(\left|\!\left|\!\left|(e_h^u, e_h^\lambda, \boldsymbol{e}_h^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}})\right|\!\right|\!\right|_h + \left|(I-\mathcal{P}_h^{k+1})u\right|_{1,h} \right) \left|(I-\mathcal{P}_h^{k+1})\phi\right|_{1,h},\end{aligned}$$

which indicates (3.29), and thus completes the proof. ■

By the above theorem, standard approximation properties of the L^2-orthogonal projection, Young's inequality, and Corollary 3.1, we immediately derive the following corollary.

Corollary 3.2. *Suppose that the dual problem (3.27) satisfies the following regularity estimate:*

$$\|\phi\|_{2,\Omega} + \|\boldsymbol{\Phi}\|_{1,\Omega} \lesssim \|e_h^u\|.$$

Then it holds

$$\|u-u_h\| \lesssim h \left(\left|\!\left|\!\left|(e_h^u, e_h^\lambda, \boldsymbol{e}_h^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}})\right|\!\right|\!\right|_h + \left\|(I-\mathcal{P}_h^k)\boldsymbol{\sigma}\right\| + h\left\|(I-\mathcal{P}_h^{k+1})f\right\| + \left|(I-\mathcal{P}_h^{k+1})u\right|_{1,h} \right) + \left\|(I-\mathcal{P}_h^{k+1})u\right\|. \tag{3.31}$$

Furthermore, if $f \in H^s(\Omega)$, $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in H^{s+1}(\Omega)$, and $u \in H^{s+2}(\Omega)$ for a nonnegative integer s, then

$$\|u-u_h\| \lesssim h^{\min\{s+2,k+2\}} \left(\|f\|_{s,\Omega} + \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_{s+1,\Omega} + \|u\|_{s+2,\Omega} \right). \tag{3.32}$$

4 Flux postprocessing

In this section we follow the idea in [19, 16] to construct a local postprocessing so as to obtain a new flux approximation $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h^* \in H(\mathrm{div};\Omega)$. We shall show that $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h^*$ converges at the same order as $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h$, while its divergence converges at one higher order than $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h$.

Define

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h^* := \boldsymbol{\sigma}_h - \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_h, \tag{4.1}$$

where, for any $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$,

$$\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_h|_T \in \mathrm{RT}_{k+1}(T) := \left\{ \boldsymbol{\tau} : \boldsymbol{\tau} = \boldsymbol{p} + q\boldsymbol{x},\ \boldsymbol{p} \in [P_{k+1}(T)]^d,\ q \in P_{k+1}(T) \right\}$$

satisfies

$$(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_h, \boldsymbol{q})_T = 0 \qquad \text{for all } \boldsymbol{q} \in [P_k(T)]^d, \tag{4.2a}$$

$$\langle \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_h \cdot \boldsymbol{n}, \mu \rangle_F = \left\langle \alpha_T(\mathcal{P}_T^\partial u_h - \lambda_h), \mu \right\rangle_F \qquad \text{for all } \mu \in P_{k+1}(F) \text{ and face } F \text{ of } T. \tag{4.2b}$$

We note that the existence and uniqueness of $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_h$ follow from the property of the RT elements [38].

We have the following theorem.

Theorem 4.1. *It holds*

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h^* \in H(\mathrm{div};\Omega) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{div}\,\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h^* = \mathcal{P}_h^{k+1}\,\mathrm{div}\,\boldsymbol{\sigma}. \tag{4.3}$$

Moreover, it holds

$$\|\boldsymbol{\sigma}-\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h^*\| \lesssim \left|\!\left|\!\left|(e_h^u, e_h^\lambda, \boldsymbol{e}_h^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}})\right|\!\right|\!\right|_h + \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}-\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h\| + \left|(I-\mathcal{P}_h^{k+1})u\right|_{1,h}, \tag{4.4}$$

which implies

$$\|\boldsymbol{\sigma}-\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h^*\| \lesssim h^{\min\{s+1,k+1\}} \left(\|f\|_{s,\Omega} + \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_{s+1,\Omega} + \|u\|_{s+2,\Omega} \right), \tag{4.5}$$

if $f \in H^s(\Omega)$, $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in H^{s+1}(\Omega)$, and $u \in H^{s+2}(\Omega)$ for a nonnegative integer s.

Proof. By (2.6c) and (4.2b), it is easy to verify that

$$(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h^* \cdot \boldsymbol{n})|_{\partial T} = 0 \quad \text{for all } T \in \mathcal{T}_h.$$

This implies $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h^* \in H(\mathrm{div};\Omega)$. From (2.6b) it follows, for all $q \in P_{k+1}(T)$,

$$-(q, \mathrm{div}\, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_h)_T + \left\langle \alpha_T(\mathcal{P}_T^\partial u_h - \lambda_h), q\right\rangle_{\partial T} = (f,q)_T.$$

Then, using integration by parts, we obtain, for all $q \in P_{k+1}(T)$,

$$(\nabla q, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_h)_T - \left\langle \boldsymbol{\sigma}_h \cdot \boldsymbol{n} - \alpha_T(\mathcal{P}_T^\partial u_h - \lambda_h), q\right\rangle_{\partial T} = (f,q)_T.$$

In view of (4.2a)–(4.2b), this implies

$$(\nabla q, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_h - \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_h)_T - \langle (\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h - \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_h)\cdot \boldsymbol{n}, q\rangle_{\partial T} = (f,q)_T \quad \text{for all } q \in P_{k+1}(T),$$

i.e.

$$(\nabla q, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_h^*)_T - \langle \boldsymbol{\sigma}_h^* \cdot \boldsymbol{n}, q\rangle_{\partial T} = (f,q)_T \quad \text{for all } q \in P_{k+1}(T).$$

From integration by parts it follows

$$-(q, \mathrm{div}\, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_h^*)_T = (f,q)_T \quad \text{for all } q \in P_{k+1}(T),$$

or equivalently,

$$(\mathrm{div}\, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_h^*)|_T = \mathcal{P}_T^{k+1} \mathrm{div}\, \boldsymbol{\sigma}.$$

Now let us show (4.4). By (4.2a) and (4.2b), a simple scaling argument yields

$$\|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_h\|_T \lesssim h_T^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left\|\mathcal{P}_T^\partial u_h - \lambda_h\right\|_{\partial T} \quad \text{for all } T \in \mathcal{T}_h.$$

By (3.7) it holds

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\|\mathcal{P}_T^\partial u_h - \lambda_h\right\|_{\partial T} \\ =\ &\left\|\mathcal{P}_T^\partial e_h^u - e_h^\lambda + \mathcal{P}_T^\partial(\mathcal{P}_T^{k+1}u - u)\right\|_{\partial T} \\ \leqslant\ &\left\|\mathcal{P}_T^\partial e_h^u - e_h^\lambda\right\|_{\partial T} + \left\|(I - \mathcal{P}_T^{k+1})u\right\|_{\partial T}. \end{aligned}$$

Using the above two estimates, we obtain

$$\|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_h\| \lesssim \left(\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} h_T^{-1}\left\|\mathcal{P}_T^\partial e_h^u - e_h^\lambda\right\|_{\partial T}^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \left(\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} h_T^{-1}\left\|(I-\mathcal{P}_T^{k+1})u\right\|_{\partial T}^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Since standard approximation properties of the L^2-orthogonal projection yield

$$h_T^{-1}\left\|(I-\mathcal{P}_T^{k+1})u\right\|_{\partial T}^2 \lesssim \left|(I-\mathcal{P}_T^{k+1})u\right|_{1,T}^2 \quad \text{for all } T \in \mathcal{T}_h,$$

it follows

$$\|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_h\| \lesssim \left(\sum_{T\in\mathcal{T}_h} h_T^{-1}\left\|\mathcal{P}_T^\partial e_h^u - e_h^\lambda\right\|_{\partial T}^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \left|(I-\mathcal{P}_h^{k+1})u\right|_{1,h}. \tag{4.6}$$

Finally, (4.4) follows from (4.1), (4.6), and the definition (3.9) of $|||\cdot|||_h$, and (4.5) follows from (4.4), Theorem 3.1, and Corollary 3.1. This completes the proof. ∎

5 Numerical experiments

This section provides numerical experiments in two-space dimensions to verify our theoretical results. We consider the problem (1.1) with $\Omega = (0,1)\times(0,1)$ and

$$\boldsymbol{c}(x,y) = \begin{pmatrix} 1+x^2y^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1+x^2y^2 \end{pmatrix},$$

and we set $u(x,y) = \sin(\pi x)\sin(\pi y)$ to be the analytic solution.

We start with an initial mesh shown in Figure 1 with $h^{-1} = 2$ and obtain a sequence of refined meshes by bisection. Numerical results are presented in Tables 1-2 for the HDG method (2.6) with $k = 0, 1$.

Table 1 shows the history of convergence for the potential approximation u_h and the flux approximation $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h$. We can see that for $k = 0$, which corresponds to the lowest order HDG method, the potential error $\|u - u_h\|$ is of second-order accuracy, and the flux error $\|\boldsymbol{\sigma} - \boldsymbol{\sigma}_h\|$ is of first-order accuracy, while for $k = 1$, $\|u - u_h\|$ is of third-order accuracy and $\|\boldsymbol{\sigma} - \boldsymbol{\sigma}_h\|$ is of second-order accuracy. These numerical results are conformable to the error estimates in Theorems 3.1-3.2 and Corollaries 3.1-3.2.

Table 2 shows the history of convergence for the postprocessed flux approximation $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h^*$. We can see that for $k = 0$, $\|\boldsymbol{\sigma} - \boldsymbol{\sigma}_h^*\|$ is of first-order accuracy, and $\|\operatorname{div}\boldsymbol{\sigma} - \operatorname{div}\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h^*\|$ is of second-order accuracy, while for $k = 1$, $\|\boldsymbol{\sigma} - \boldsymbol{\sigma}_h^*\|$ is of second-order accuracy and $\|\operatorname{div}\boldsymbol{\sigma} - \operatorname{div}\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h^*\|$ is of third-order accuracy. These numerical results are conformable to the error estimates in Theorem 4.1.



Figure 1: Initial mesh with $h^{-1} = 2$

Degree k	Mesh h^{-1}	$\|u - u_h\|$		$\|\boldsymbol{\sigma} - \boldsymbol{\sigma}_h\|$	
		Error	Order	Error	Order
0	2	3.052e-1	-	1.230	-
	4	7.828e-2	1.963	6.443e-1	0.933
	8	1.968e-2	1.992	3.250e-1	0.987
	16	4.927e-3	1.998	1.629e-1	0.997
	32	1.232e-3	1.999	8.147e-2	0.999
1	2	3.431e-2	-	2.524e-1	-
	4	4.376e-3	2.971	6.211e-2	2.023
	8	5.510e-4	2.990	1.552e-2	2.000
	16	6.900e-5	2.997	3.882e-3	2.000

Table 1: History of convergence for u_h and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h$

Degree k	Mesh h^{-1}	$\|\boldsymbol{\sigma} - \boldsymbol{\sigma}_h^*\|$		$\|\operatorname{div}\boldsymbol{\sigma} - \operatorname{div}\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h^*\|$	
		Error	Order	Error	Order
0	2	1.080	-	0.7003	-
	4	5.616e-1	0.944	0.1861	1.912
	8	2.826e-1	0.991	0.0470	1.985
	16	1.415e-1	0.998	0.0118	1.996
	32	7.078e-2	0.999	0.0029	1.999
1	2	2.278e-1	-	0.0114	-
	4	5.514e-2	2.046	0.0014	3.015
	8	1.373e-2	2.006	1.7919e-4	2.997
	16	3.429e-3	2.001	2.2405e-5	2.999

Table 2: History of convergence for $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_h^*$

References

[1] R. A. Adams and J. J. F. Fournier, Sobolev Spaces, Academic Press, 2nd ed., 2003. 3

[2] D. N. Arnold and F. Brezzi, Mixed and non-conforming finite element methods: implementation, post-processing and error estimates, Modél. Math. Anal. Numér., 19 (1985), 7-35. 2

[3] S. N. Atluri and H. Murakawa, On hybrid finite element models in nonlinear solid mechanics, Finite elements in nonlinear mechanics, 1 (1977), 3-41. 1

[4] I. Babuska, J. Oden and J. Lee, Mixed-hybrid finite element approximations of second-order elliptic boundary-value problems, Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg., 11 (1977), 175-206. 1

[5] D. Braess, Enhanced assumed strain elements and locking in membrane problems, Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg., 165 (1998), 155-174. 1

[6] D. Braess, C. Carstensen and B. D. Reddy, Uniform convergence and a posteriori error estimators for the enhanced strain finite element method, Numer. Math., 96 (2004), 461-479. 1

[7] F. Brezzi, On the existence, uniqueness and approximation of saddle-point problems arising from Lagrangian multipliers, R.A.I.R.O. Anal Numer., 8 (1974), 129-151. 1

[8] F. Brezzi, J. Douglas. Jr. and L. D. Marini, Two families of mixed finite elements for second order elliptic problems, Numer. Math., 47 (1985), 217-235. 2, 7

[9] F. Brezzi and M. Fortin, Mixed and Hybrid Finite Element Methods, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1991. 1

[10] F. Brezzi and L. D. Marini, On the numerical solution of plate bending problems by hybrid methods, R.A.I.R.O. Anal Numer., 9 (1975), 5-50. 1

[11] P. Ciarlet, The finite element method for elliptic problems, North-Holland, Armsterdam, 1978. 1

[12] B. Cockburn and B. Dong, An analysis of the minimal dissipation local discontinuous Galerkin method for convection-diffusion problems, J. Sci. Comput., 32 (2007), 233-262.

[13] B. Cockburn, O. Dubois, J. Gopalakrishnan and S. Tan, Multigrid for an HDG method, IMA J. Numer. Anal., 34 (2014), 1386-1425. 2

[14] B. Cockburn and J. Gopalakrishnan, A characterization of hybridized mixed methods for second order elliptic problems, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 42 (2004), 283-301. 2

[15] B. Cockburn, J. Gopalakrishnan and R. Lazarov, Unified hybridization of discontinuous Galerkin, mixed, and conforming Galerkin methods for second order elliptic problems, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 47 (2009), 1319-1365. 1, 2, 3

[16] B. Cockburn, J. Gopalakrishnan and F. J. Sayas, A projection-based error analysis of HDG methods, Math. Comp., 79 (2010), 1351-1367. 2, 10, 13

[17] B. Cockburn, J. Guzmán, S. C. Soon and H. K. Stolarski, An analysis of the embedded discontinuous Galerkin method for second order elliptic problems, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 47 (2009), 2686-2707.

[18] B. Cockburn, J. Gopalakrishnan and H. Wang, Locally conservative fluxes for the continuous Galerkin method, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 45 (2007), 1742-1776. 2

[19] B. Cockburn, J. Guzmán and H. Wang, Superconvergent discontinuous Galerkin methods for second-order elliptic problems, Math. Comp., 78 (2009), 1-24. 13

[20] B. Cockburn, W. Qiu and K. Shi, Conditions for superconvergence of HDG methods for second-order elliptic problems, Math. Comp., 81 (2012), 1327-1353. 2

[21] M. Farhloul and M. Fortin, Dual hybrid methods for the elasticity and the Stokes problems: a unified approach, Numer. Math., 76 (1997), 419-440.

[22] B. Fraejis De Veubeke, Displacement and equilibrium models in the finite element method, in Stress Analysis, O. C. Zienkiewicz and G. Holister, eds., Wiley, New York, 1965. 1

[23] T. Gudi, A new error analysis for discontinuous finite element methods for linear elliptic problems, Math. Comp., 79 (2010), 2169-2189. 2, 4

[24] E. P. Kasper and R. L. Taylor, A mixed-enhanced strain method - part I: Geometrically linear problems, Comp. Struct., 75 (2000), 237-250. 1

[25] C. Lehrenfeld, Hybrid Discontinuous Galerkin Methods for Solving Incompressible Flow Problems, PhD Thesis, RWTH Aachen University (2010). 2

[26] J. Oden and J. Lee, Dual-Mixed Hybrid finite element method for second-order elliptic problems, Lecture Notes in Mathematics 606 (1977), 275-291. 1

[27] I. Oikawa, A Hybridized Discontinuous Galerkin Method with Reduced Stabilization, J. Sci. Comput., 65 (2015), 327-340. 2

[28] T. H. H. Pian, Derivation of element stiffness matrices by assumed stress distributions, AIAA Journal, 2 (1964), 1333-1336. 1

[29] T. H. H. Pian, Finite element formulation by variational principles with relaxed continuity requirements, The Mathematical Foundations of the Finite Element Method with Applications to Partial Differential Equations, Part II (A. K. Aziz, Editor), Academic Press, New York, 1972, pp. 671-687. MR 49 #11824. 1

[30] T. H. H. Pian, State-of-the-art development of hybrid/mixed finite element method, Finite Elements in Analysis and Design, 21 (1995), 5-20. 1

[31] T. H. H. Pian and K. Sumihara, Rational approach for assumed stress finite elements. Internat. J. Numer. Methods Engrg., 20 (1984), 1685-1695. 1

[32] T. H. H. Pian and P. Tong, Basis of finite element methods for solid continua, Internat. J. Numer. Methods Engrg., 1 (1969), 3-28. 1

[33] T. H. H. Pian and P. Tong, Relations between incompatible displacement model and hybrid stress model, Internat. J. Numer. Methods Engrg., 22 (1986), 173-181. 1

[34] T. H. H. Pian and C. C. Wu, A rational approach for choosing stress terms for hybrid finite element formulations, Internat. J. Numer. Methods Engrg., 26 (1988), 2331-2343. 1

[35] E. F. Punch and S. N. Atluri, Development and testing of stable, invariant, isoparametric curvilinear 2- and 3-D hybrid-stress elements, Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Eng., 47 (1984), 331-356. 1

[36] W. Qiu and K. Shi, An HDG method for convection diffusion equation, J. Sci. Comput., 18 (2015), 1-12. 2

[37] W. Qiu, J. Shen and K. Shi, An HDG method for linear elasticity with strong symmetric stresses, arXiv:1312.1407. 2

[38] P. A. Raviart and J. M. Thomas, A mixed finite element method for second order elliptic problems, Mathematical Aspects of Finite Element Method (I. Galligani, E. Magenes, eds.), Lecture Notes in Mathmatics, vol. 606, Springer, Berlin Heidelberg New York, 1977, 292-315. 13

[39] P. A. Raviart and J. M. Thomas, Primal hybrid finite element methods for 2nd order elliptic equations, J. Mathematics of computation, 31 (1977), 391-413. 1

[40] P. A. Raviart and J. M. Thomas, Dual finite element models for second order elliptic problems, J. Energy methods in finite element analysis.(A 79-53076 24-39) Chichester, Sussex, England, Wiley-Interscience, 1979, 175-191. 1

[41] B. Reddy and J. Simo, Stability and convergence of a class of enhanced strain methods, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 32 (1995), 1705-1728. 1

[42] J. Roberts and J. Thomas, Mixed and hybrid methods, in Handbook of Numerical Analysis, II, Handb. Numer. Anal., II, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1991, 523-639. 1

[43] J. Simo and M. Rifai, A class of mixed assumed strain methods and the method of incompatible modes, Internat. J. Numer. Methods Engrg., 29 (1990), 1595-1638. 1

[44] K. Y. Sze, Efficient formulation of robust hybrid elements using orthogonal stress/strain interpolants and admissible matrix formulation, Internat. J. Numer. Methods Engng., 35 (1992), 1-20. 1

[45] K. Y. Sze, Hybrid hexahedral element for solids,plates,shells and beams by selective scaling, Internat. J. Numer. Methods Engng., 36 (1993), 1519-1540. 1

[46] X. Xie and T. Zhou, Optimization of stress modes by energy compatibility for 4-node hybrid quadrilaterals, Internat. J. Numer. Methods Engrg., 59 (2004), 293-313. 1

[47] G. Yu, X. Xie and C. Carstensen, Uniform convergence and a posteriori error estimation for assumed stress hybrid finite element methods, Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg., 200 (2011), 2421-2433. 1

[48] S. Zhang and X. Xie, Accurate 8-node hybrid hexahedral elements with energy-compatible stress modes, Adv. Appl. Math. Mech., 2 (2010), 333-354. 1

[49] T. Zhou and X. Xie, A unified analysis for stress/strain hybrid methods of high performance, Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg., 191 (2002), 4619-4640. 1